EXHIBIT A

,06BYVER1, 1 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK 2 3 BEATRIZ VEERMAN and KHADIJETOU BA, 4 Plaintiffs, 5 08 Cv. 5042 (LB) 6 DEEP BLUE GROUP, LLC., 7 et al., 8 Defendants. 10 June 11, 2010 11 9:30 p.m. 12 Before: 13 HON. LARRY BURNS, 14 District Judge 15 APPEARANCES 16 GOLDBERG & FLIEGEL, LLP 17 Attorneys for Plaintiffs 60 East 42nd Street 18 New York, New York KENNETH A. GOLDBERG, ESQ., JONATHAN MARGOLIS, ESQ., 19 Of counsel 20 21 LEONARD ZACK & ASSOCIATES, Attorneys for Defendants 22 405 Park Avenue New York, New York 23 LINDA FRIDEGOTTO, ESQ., MARTIN CRAUS; ESQ., 24 Of counsel 25

THE COURT: This is the matter of Veerman, et al, versus Deep Blue Group, LLC, et al.

May I have appearances of the counsel for the record, please.

MR. GOLDBERG: Kenneth Goldberg representing the plaintiffs.

THE COURT: Good morning.

MS. FRIDEGOTTO: Good morning, your Honor. Linda Fridegotto alley representing defendants.

THE COURT: Good morning.

The jury is not present. We have not selected a jury yet.

The court has read and considered certain pretrial motions filed on behalf of the parties. I have discussed court procedures with the parties informally and prepared to hear brief argument on the motions in limine and rule on those before we summoned a jury and select a jury.

Ms. Goldberg, I am happy to hear from you.

MR. GOLDBERG: Thank you, your Honor.

On the plaintiffs' motion in limine, which was to preclude the testimony of defendant witness John Liegey.

Mr. Liegey is a customer of Opia or was a customer.

He is not an employee or manager of the defendant. He, as a customer, we say he's not at Opia often enough to be a relevant fact witness.

The defendants, I believe, will say he dated one or more of the plaintiffs. My clients say that is not true. Even if that was true, that would be some consensual relationship that really wouldn't be part of the sexual harassment case against Opia and co-owners.

Under Rule 412 of the Federal Rules of Evidence and a case in the Second Circuit called Wolak, 217 F.3d 157, we believe that any sexual behavior by my clients outside of work, such as if they went on a date with somebody, would be under that case law irrelevant and inadmissible.

I do not see the relevance of defendants calling
Mr. Liegey to testify. He might say I did not see any
wrongdoing at the workplace, they did not complain to me,
Mr. Liegey is not in the management chain and if he came to
Opia on a given day and didn't see something happening, that is
not relevant to prove there was unlawful conduct against my
clients.

We stand on our paper. I wanted to supplement it with the cite and Wolak case.

THE COURT: Thank you.

Ms. Fridegotto.

MS. FRIDEGOTTO: An inherent part of plaintiffs' claims against the defendants is the issue that they were required by management to give their phone numbers to customers and that this was a practice that was basically imposed upon

them and that they were inherently forced to do this against their will.

We believe that someone like Mr. Liegey, who both plaintiffs in their previous testimony at depositions had indicated was THERE very, very, very frequently and had been there many, many times and to whom they had agreed had possible consensual conduct with, such as frequenting him outside the restaurant or going out and meeting him for drinks with friends on other occasions, that kind of information, in our opinion, is very relevant, because it goes to show that, you know, that there was contact with the customers that was consensual and that it was done regularly.

I mean, one of the plaintiffs met her fiancee at Opia. He was a customer, too. It is inherent in everyday life that we get to meet people, sometimes at work, sometimes not at work, and we think that Mr. Liegey's testimony would basically just indicate that he had interactions with the plaintiffs at their place of employment, that these interactions were not unwelcomed, that they actually became friendly and that he was never in any way, shape or form forced by the managers -- sorry -- that there was -- the managers were not in any way, I guess, involved in the creation, I guess, of this consensual relationship or of this friendship.

THE COURT: As I understand it, you want to offer Mr. Liegey to testify to the following:

. 9

That he dated Ms. Veerman, is that right?

MS. FRIDEGOTTO: No, your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay.

MS. FRIDEGOTTO: That was what he had -- that is what had been proffered in an affidavit that Mr. Liegey had given at the EEOC stage.

There was a lot of information with regards to his interactions with Veerman at Opia, his interactions with Ba at Opia. That is the issue whether or not they would have complained to him about the presence -- I'm sorry, your Honor, these are my clients.

Your Honor, I want to introduce to you Antoine Blech and Mr. Frederick Lesort.

THE COURT: Good morning, gentlemen.

I have the impression that Mr. Liegey's testimony, I understand he's not available, right, it's going to be offered by?

MS. FRIDEGOTTO: He actually most probably will be available.

THE COURT: All right.

MS. FRIDEGOTTO: There had been some initial doubt at the very beginning, your Honor, because of his schedule because of his travel, previous travel commitments and because we didn't realize what day we actually would be starting the trial.

THE COURT: I was led to believe that Mr. Liegey's proffered testimony would be that he had dated Ms. Veerman and according to him, at least, that they had been intimate, that Ms. Ba had wanted to date him and tried to date him, that neither plaintiff complained to them about the defendants and he personally had not witnessed any unlawful conduct and that he had a conversation at some point with Ms. Veerman in which she said she wanted to sue Opia.

I thought those were the things that he was --

MS. FRIDEGOTTO: Those are some of the statements that were made within the context of that affidavit, but those were picked and chosen by plaintiff in his motion in limine to try and, I guess, inflame the whole issue of -- John Liegey was a customer at Opia and he was a very regular customer and he has known both defendants for a very long time. He has frequented this place since it opened and he had almost very frequent contact also by the plaintiffs' own admission at the restaurant. He had a relationship with one of them, according to the statement that he made.

THE COURT: Mr. Goldberg, is this the plaintiffs' intention to offer as part of the evidence of the hostile work environment claim that they were forced to date customers against their will or go out with customers against their will?

MR. GOLDBERG: It is their testimony that the owners directed them to give their phone numbers to certain customers.

Mr. Liegey is not one of those customers. There were a couple of customers they were told give your number to that person.

Mr. Liegey is not included in that category.

THE COURT: Your point is that the plaintiffs on their own gave their numbers to some customers? That is part of the gist of what Mr. Liegey was saying?

MS. FRIDEGOTTO: Yes, your Honor. The fact that plaintiffs could have chosen and were free to give their numbers to whomever they wished.

THE COURT: And defendants deny the allegation that they told plaintiffs they had to give their numbers to certain customers?

MS. FRIDEGOTTO: Absolutely.

THE COURT: Okay.

Anything more?

(Pause)

The court is prepared to rule on the motion in limine.

I have a written order that forms the rulings. I will just read it in the record and provide copies and file it told.

MR. GOLDBERG: I did have one comment on the defendant's motion.

With respect to the issue of Mr. Blech's marital status, your Honor, in going through the plaintiffs' Rule 56.1 summary judgment statement I saw that one of the incidents of sexual harassment occurred when Mr. Blech hosted a birthday

party for his wife at Opia and introduced his wife and children in my client. And so, against, in talking about the incidents of harassment, one of the incidents was at the wife's birthday party. Add that to the issue of the marital status is just one of the facts in this case.

THE COURT: I understand that Mr. Blech was married at the time of these incidents and is no longer married and separated?

MS. FRIDEGOTTO: He is very much married, your Honor.

THE COURT: Again, I don't know where I got that.

Let me make sure I understand what the dispute is here. That the defendants don't want this marital status to come in?

MS. FRIDEGOTTO: We don't believe it is relevant, your Honor.

THE COURT: Well, okay. All right.

The court rules as follows.

In preparation for trial the parties filed motions in limine seeking to admit and exclude certain evidence.

Defendants have asked the court to exclude testimony concerning dating and allegedly sexual contact at Opia, the restaurant where the plaintiffs' worked, and the sight of many of the incidents that are at issue in this case.

The plaintiffs, in particular, seek to exclude testimony from a long-time customer of Opia, Mr. John Liegey.

Plaintiffs have brought their claims under several different theories, but the deputed evidence primarily concern claims that arise from alleged sexual harassment in violation of Title VII, and the briefing shows that the plaintiffs are primarily pursuing a hostile work environment theory.

For their part the defendants seek to exclude evidence that includes dating and sexual conduct in a variety of circumstances that involves different staff members.

At this point, having read the papers, the specifics of much of the testimony are unclear. I have some of the specifics in mind, but by no means do I have a full understanding of what the specifics would be.

Some of the conduct it appears may have been welcomed by staff members while other conduct certainly was not.

Plaintiffs say that they witnessed some of the conduct personally, they heard about other conduct. The defendants arque that the evidence is irrelevant or unduly prejudicial.

The court assesses a hostile work environment based on the totality of circumstances. Instances of harassment that are not directed at the plaintiff may be relevant to show the overall work environment and if the plaintiff is emotionally traumatized as a result of the workplace being permeated by sexual discrimination then she can recovery. It is the ruling in Leibovitz versus New York Transit Authority, 252 F.3d 179 at 185.

However, harassment directed at others can contribute to the establishment of a hostile work environment irrespective whether the harassment is directed at the plaintiffs.

A title VII claim can't be based solely on incidents that plaintiff has heard about, Leibovitz holds to that effect, but evidence of other incidents can be relevant to show the type of environment that plaintiffs were subjected to.

If the plaintiffs can show that they were affected by the defendant's behavior in the restaurant during the relevant period of time, then the evidence of that behavior would be relevant. Evidence is not admissible to show, however, simply that the defendants behaved similarly on other occasions.

That would be impermissible under Federal Rule of Evidence 404(b), nor is the evidence of behavior that had no effect on the plaintiffs relevant.

Defendants have argued that evidence of their sexual contact with staff is only relevant if the plaintiffs can show it was nonconsensual or unwelcomed to other members of the staff.

Plaintiffs have proffered some evidence that some of the incidents respecting other staff members were unwelcomed. However, the applicable test is not whether the other staff members consented to or welcomed the defendants' advances, but whether the defendant's behavior or the behavior they encouraged was objectively offensive or created a hostile work

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

environment for the plaintiffs.

A persistent and sexually-charged atmosphere even if some of the instance were welcomed can provide support for a the hostile work environment claim.

Here part of the plaintiffs' proffered testimony consists of incidents other employees reported to them. The defendants have objected to this evidence as hearsay and with minimal exception the court agrees with the hearsay objection.

Proffered testimony does appear to me to be hearsay not within any recognized exception, and is, thus, inadmissible if offered to prove that the incidents actually occurred. However, because the plaintiffs have to show they were affected by the environment in which they worked, reports of sexual incidents might be admissible to show the effects that those incidents had on the plaintiffs. These reports, however, are only relevant if the actual incidents occurred.` Plaintiffs, therefore, have to offer admissible non-hearsay evidence to show that the incidents in question actually To the extent they are able to do so, then plaintiffs may testify that they were told about the incidents. The testimony cannot be used, however, to provide new information or fill in details. To this limited extent the plaintiffs' testimony about what other staff members told them is excluded.

Defendants have offered Mr. Liegey, a long-time

. 1

regular customer of the Opia bar and the plaintiffs seek to exclude his testimony.

I have confirmed today that perhaps Mr. Liegey will not testify to all the things that it appeared he was proffered to testify in the papers.

Again, surprising, what the papers suggested Mr. Liegey was being offered as a witness to testify that he dated Ms. Veerman and that they had an intimate relationship, testified that Ms. Ba had wanted to date him and had tried to date him, that the plaintiffs didn't complain to him about the defendants, that he didn't witness the unlawful conduct and a at some point Ms. Veerman said she wanted to sue the restaurant to get money.

Mr. Liegey's affidavit, which I've read, touched on a few other issues, but these are the part of the testimony.

The court agrees with the plaintiffs that the evidence proffered respecting Mr. Liegey is for the most part not relevant and, therefore, must be excluded.

Plaintiffs' consensual conduct in other contexts is not relevant to show that she was not subject to a hostile work environment.

Whether Ms. Veerman welcomed the dating or intimate relationship with Mr. Liegey really had no bearing whether they are willing to date or have sexual contact with any men that the defendants might send their way or whether the defendants'

conduct in other respects created a hostile work environment.

In this respect, Ms. Fridegotto, I will permit you to inquire of the plaintiffs whether they, generally speaking, dated other men on their own inasmuch as that was part of their claim they were forced to do that, you may certainly inquire were there instances you met people at the bar and on your own without impetus from the defendants went out with them and gave the phone numbers. I think that is a fair reply to the allegations so I will permit that.

In other respects that Mr. Liegey's testimony was offered, he was a long-time customer at the bar. It is clear to the court based on the affidavit that he was present at the restaurant several days a week. He saw the plaintiffs frequently, he saw other staff there frequently, was familiar with them. But I agree with Mr. Goldberg that his not having observed the alleged behavior is not probative of whether it happened. There is no showing that the defendants were likely to harass the plaintiffs or otherwise misbehaved in front of Mr. Liegey or that plaintiffs would have probably complained to him if they were mistreated.

In fact, to the contrary, Mr. Liegey's affidavit says at one time Mr. Veerman mentioned having trouble with the defendants and considered suing them and Mr. Liegey discouraged her from that. This implies to the court that Ms. Veerman realized that Mr. Liegey may not have welcomed her complaints

about the defendants. So I don't make a lot out of that.

Ms. Veerman's remarks, alleged remarks to Mr. Liegey about needing money and her plans to sue the defendants I regard as unremarkable. While the affidavit couched in terms as sort of hints at mendacity and extortion, there is nothing in what Ms. Veerman reportedly said that unambiguously supports these inferences. Almost everybody wants or needs money and the fact that Ms. Veerman did at some point doesn't strike me as relevant. So I do exclude that testimony.

Likewise, there is no need for testimony to establish that Ms. Veerman planned to sue people that she thought injured her and looking for monetary damages because a lawsuit itself makes that utterly plain at this point.

Ms. Veerman's statement Mr. Liegey repeats that the lawsuit would cause the defendants bad publicity I find to be likewise irrelevant.

Accordingly, the court finds under 402 that all of that proffered testimony of Mr. Liegey is not relevant and will be excluded.

In sum, the defendants' motion in limine is granted in part. Plaintiffs may only offer evidence of what other staff told them if they offer evidence sufficient to support a finding that the incidents that they were told about actually occurred. The court will give appropriate limiting instructions if such evidence is offered. The testimony of the

incidents must be established through other evidence, not by what plaintiffs were told. In all other respects, defendants' motion in limine is denied.

Plaintiffs' motion in limine to exclude the testimony of Mr. Liegey is granted.

Okay.

As I said, I intend to file this as a written order and I enter the order without prejudice. Obviously, if something different or unexpected comes out during the course of the trial, either counsel can ask me to reconsider aspects of the motion in limine, but you should be guided by that in asking your questions in the first instance.

Any questions?

MS. FRIDEGOTTO: Not at this time, your Honor.

THE COURT: All right.

Are we ready?

I can bring the jury. We will briefly recess while Mr. Lopez brings in our prospective jurors.

(Recess)

(Jury panel of prospective jurors was seated)

THE CLERK: In the matter of Beatriz Veerman against Deep Blue Group, LLC, Opia, Frederick Lesort and Antoine Blech for trial by jury.

Are the plaintiffs ready to proceed?

MR. GOLDBERG: Yes.

THE CLERK: Are the defendants ready to proceed?

MS. FRIDEGOTTO: Yes.

THE CLERK: The Honorable Larry Burns presiding.

THE COURT: Ladies and gentlemen, good morning.

Welcome to the United States District Court for the Southern District of New York.

We have summoned you here today in connection with a civil case. I'm going to tell you a little bit about the case, also tell you a little bit about our logistics here.

It is expected that this case is going to last about four or five days. The parties have agreed to present their cases respectively within ten hours per side. That is ten hours of testimony and argument and opening statements and all so that is everything.

We will take reasonable breaks, of course, that's why I can't be entirely precise and give you exactly the time that the case will be submitted to those of you who are selected to hear it, but I think, my best estimate, is about four or five days on this. It will obviously go over until next week.

Here is what this case is about:

The plaintiffs in the case are Beatriz Veerman and Khadijetou Ba, these two young ladies to my left at counsel table. They were servers at a restaurant called Opia, O-P-I-A. That is in midtown, Manhattan, I'm told.

Opia is owned in part and managed by Mr. Frederick

Lesort and Mr. Antoine Blech -- these are the two gentleman to my right at the other counsel table -- through a company that is called Deep Blue Group.

Ms. Veerman and Ms. Ba have brought these claims against Opia, the restaurant, Deep Blue Group, the ownership group, and Mr. Lesort and Mr. Blech relating to their former employment at that restaurant, at Opia.

First, Ms. Veerman and Ms. Ba alleged they were sexually harassed while they were employed at the restaurant and that they were required to work in a sexually hostile work environment. They allege that Mr. Lesort, Mr. Blech participated in the harassment through verbal and fiscal sexual harassment.

The defendants for their part deny these allegations.

Second, Ms. Veerman and Ms. Ba allege that Opia and the Deep Blue Group, that is the ownership group, and Mr. Lesort and Mr. Blech discriminated against them on the base of race, color and national origin by giving them less desirable work shifts. They also allege they were also harassed and discriminated against and discharged from employment based on their race and their color and national origin.

Again, the defendants deny these allegations.

Third, Ms. Veerman and Ms. Ba allege that Opia and the Deep Blue Group and Mr. Lesort, Mr. Blech unlawfully retaliated

against them and terminated their employment after they complained about the discrimination that they were experiencing, and that Ba also claims that she was retaliated against and discharged from employment after she opposed their demand to pay an unpaid customer bill in violation of New York State labor law.

Again, with respect to the allegations I just read you, the defendants deny each and every one of those allegations.

Finally, Ms. Veerman and Ms. Ba Opia, Deep Blue Group, Mr. Lesort and Mr. Blech took away five percent of their tips during the time that they were working at the restaurant. This is also alleged to be a violation of New York State labor law.

And, again, with respect to these final allegations, the defendants deny them.

We have summoned you here and we are having a trial because obviously the parties disagree on what the evidence is going to show and the statement I just read you sort of sums up the disagreement.

We want to pick eight of you who have no preconceptions at this point about what the outcome here should be to hear the case and decide it, let the chips fall where they will, let the evidence take you where it will. Toward that end we are going to ask you some questions, get to know a little bit about you.

. 6

There are no right answers to these questions, there are only honest ones.

I met with counsel beforehand and anticipated that maybe some prospective jurors will say, no, I had an incident that is just too close to that is being alleged, I don't think I can fairly judge a case like that.

If you are in that category, then freely admit it. We have lots of cases going out and I would send you back to the jury administrator and have you sent on another case.

As a matter of fact, I recognize two of our prospective juror today who have been here before on other cases so I know there are cases going out every day.

Let me tell you the way the process works. I don't know what you are used told.

How many have been through jury selection before, either here or in the state court?

(Hands)

A lot of you.

Sometimes the process can be very tedious and long. I vowed to myself many years ago that I would not participate in those long processes again. It usually takes about an hour 15 minutes, an hour and 30 minutes to assemble a jury.

I have put together a questionnaire. All of you should have a copy of that on your chairs. It is just general questions.

It is not my intent and it certainly is not the intent of the parties to embarrass anybody. I suppose potentially there are a couple of questions on there that might be embarrassing and you may not want to answer in front of everybody else. If that is the case let me know and I will ask you answer in front of me and the lawyers at the bench.

But, again, I'm looking for broad strokes. If you think there is anything that might cause you to tilt one way or the other without hearing any evidence in this case, then that is something we should know about and then the lawyers ought to be able to assess.

There are two types of challenges to prospective jurors on a case, one is called a challenge for cause.

If one of you says, for example, you know, I just went through an employment situation like that myself this last year, I'm an employer, I am an employee the same thing happened and I just don't think I can be fair in a case like this, I would excuse you for cause. As the name implies, there is reason to excuse you from this case, you can't be fair.

The more familiar type of challenge is what is called a peremptory challenge. The lawyers on both sides have three of these and they can exclude up to six of you, three each side, for any reason. They may not like the fact that you got a green sweatshirt on today. They don't have to give me any reason for those challenges, it's completely up to them.

I have told jurors in the past and I will say this to those of you assembled today as prospective jurors it really says more about the lawyers than it does about you if you get challenged on a peremptory basis.

I have been at this for a long time. I started when I was a young man, 24 years old, trying cases. You know what my rule of thumb was back then? No one younger than I on the jury. That has changed over time, but no one younger than I. What informed my thinking, well, older people made more decisions, they made harder decisions, they got a greater stake in the community.

That was what I was thinking when I was out picking a jury. Did I excuse younger people who probably were just fine and voted with me in my favor? Of course I did. Did it say more about me than the people being excused? Of course it did.

So bear that in mind as we go through this process.

It's not personnel, it does really say more about what the lawyers are thinking than about any attribute of any prospective juror.

So that's what this case is about.

I promise you this, and two prospective jurors who were here last time will probably say, well, I guess he means what he says, we will make efficient use of your time.

We had a case that we started last week that was supposed to last five days, started it Monday, and it was over

by 2:00 o'clock yesterday.

I understand I'm not so far removed from being a regular human being that I don't understand that all of you have important things to do and that this is sort of crimping your schedule. There are probably other places that you rather be. I understand that.

This is important matter, though, to these parties.

They waited to have it resolved. They want eight conscientious people to listen to the evidence and to give them a decision over this dispute. In our country, we afford that. Our legal system affords that. Any one of us would want to have the same privilege if he were in either the plaintiffs' or defendants' position.

We appreciate your being here. We will make efficient use of your time. There are not going to be long periods sitting around and talk to the lawyers. I met with them and told them my protocol, which is to make hey when the sun shines. When the jury is here we are going to be in session, we are going to hear testimony. I will take up legal issues at breaks.

I can't give you a precise time when this case will end, but I do commit to you that we are mindful of the sacrifice that you are making by being here.

BY THE COURT:

Q. All right. With those things said, Elizabeth Kelley,

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

please stand and answer the questions on the sheet.

A. I live in Mamaroneck New York, which is in Westchester County, and I've lived there for 40 years.

We own our home.

Actually, I've lived in Mamaroneck for 37 years and New Rochell for three years before that.

We own our home.

I graduated high school, I didn't go on after that.

I am an executive assistant working for the CEO and CFO of Eight O'clock Coffee Company, which also Teatley Tea --

- Q. What kind of company?
- A. Eight O'clock Coffee, and we also own Teatley Tea.
- 13 | Q. Hold on a second. I want to follow along.
 - A. Yes, I am married and my husband is a sergeant in the Mamaroneck police department.

Yes, I have a child. He is 22 years old. He has just graduated from college and he is an emergency medical technician at the moment working in the city.

I have not served as a juror before.

Cross-connection certainly would be my husband.

- Q. Does he testify from time to time as a police officer?

 Does he come to court and testify?
- A. He has only been involved in relation to another question in one particular case which was against police officers internally in the police department, not involving him but as a

- sergeant of the department he was called in. That's the only time.
 - Q. Was there a time earlier in his career when he was a patrol officer and had to come to court and testify?
 - A. No.

3

4

5

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

25

- 6 | Q. Okay.
 - A. I love to garden, I love to hike and I am a member of our local citizens emergency response team as well as pet sheltering in emergencies.

There is no reason why I can't serve fairly and impartially.

- Q. You heard the allegations that have been made in this case, the allegations are denied and, as I said, there is going to be a confrontation of evidence that we want you to resolve. Are you up to the task here?
- A. Absolutely.
- Q. Nothing about this case that is troublesome to you at the outset here such as you have a lack of confidence about ability to render a fair and impartial decision?
- A. Not at all.
- 21 | Q. Thank you very much.
- 22 | BY THE COURT:
- 23 | Q. Mr. Jones, good morning.
- 24 | A. Good morning.
 - I live in Mount Vernon, New York. I lived there for

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

1 | about 30 years. I rent my home.

I've gone through a year of college.

I'm staff administrator. I'm currently unemployed right now.

I'm single. I have no children.

I've served as a juror before in a criminal case many years ago.

- Q. Did the jury reach a decision in that case?
- A. Yes, they did.

10 I have a friend who is studying to be a lawyer.

- 11 | Q. Is it a man or woman?
- 12 | A. A man.
- 13 | Q. Do you talk to him often about his studies?
- 14 A. Not really.
- Q. Ever have a conversation about any of the areas of the law
- 16 | that are implicated in this case?
- 17 | A. Not that I can recall.
- 18 | Q. Okay.
- 19 | A. Have you had any friends in lawsuits?

I believe my niece is going through something right
now. She had a problem with her eyes and her doctor so they
are going through something. I don't know how far that is

23 going.

24

25

My free time I'm into music and bowling. And I don't see any reason why I can't continue this.

- 1 | Q. Thank you, Mr. Jones. I appreciate your answers.
- 2 BY THE COURT:
- 3 | Q. Mr. Lewyn, good morning again.
- 4 A. Good morning again, Judge.
- Q. You are one of the guys that can verify what I said about making efficient use of time. I bet you didn't think that case
- 7 | would be over.
- 8 A. Actually, you said three or four days.
- 9 Q. Mr. Lewyn is a lawyer who is a prospective juror in the other case.
- 11 Anyway, tell us about yourself.
- 12 A. I'm a senior litigation attorney with C&A, I have done

 13 insurance defense work since 1980, live in Manhattan, married,

 14 two children.
 - I think as I told you before, I might have -- I have done insurance defense work since 1980, so I like to think I'm fair as I told you before, but --
 - Q. Do you know these counsel at all?
- 19 | A. I don't know who they are. They weren't introduced to us.
 - Q. Let me take a minute and do that. I apologize.
 - Mr. Goldberg, if you would like to stand and reintroduce yourself to me and Mr. Margolis and introduce your clients and tell the prospective jurors about yourself.
 - (Continue on next page)

2425

15

16

17

18

20

21

22

23

MR. GOLDBERG: Good morning.

My name is Kenneth Goldberg. I am an attorney. This is Jonathan Margolis, an attorney at my office. These are my clients Beatriz Veerman and Khadijetou Ba.

My office focuses on representing individuals in employment discrimination cases. So that's typically what my case load is, employees that a terminated and harassed.

Ms. Fridegotto, would you like to introduce yourself to the jurors, your co-counsel and clients.

MS. FRIDEGOTTO: My name is Linda Fridegotto and I am with the firm Havkins Rosenfeld Ritzert & Varriale. Seated right here is Matthew Krauss. My two clients are Mr. Lesort and Mr. Blech. My main area of expertise is litigation and that's it. Thank you.

THE COURT: Do any of the perspective juror know Mr. Goldberg or Ms. Fridegotto or any of the other folks that are here today, the plaintiffs or the defendants? No one so indicates.

Mr. Lewyn, I don't want to short circuit this but if you feel based on what I've read that this is a case that might challenge your ability to be fair and impartial --

THE JUROR: There's a concern, judge.

THE COURT: Okay. I don't want to put words in your mouth. I know on the other case that you had the same concern.

On the other hand you know you are here and in your capacity as

a private citizen I know as a lawyer you believe in the rule of law and all the principles that I talk about with perspective jurors. Could you put aside what you do for a living and put on your citizen hat and listen to the case and fairly judge it?

THE JUROR: I guess my one concern is that I'd be giving the defendant maybe a little fraction of a head start since I've done this for a number of different carriers since 1998.

THE COURT: And you have had a lot of opportunity to think about jury service and what kinds of cases you might be called to serve on might be better to tell the jury administrator to only send you out on criminal cases. If you want me to have Mr. Lopez do that that will avoid this drill.

THE JUROR: I did intern years ago for the DA's office.

THE COURT: What have they told but your term of service? How long do you have to keep coming back before you are finally excused if you don't get picked?

THE JUROR: I started on Monday. They indicate you have an obligation up to two weeks. They did pass us for the last couple days and then we were asked to return here so I have no idea how long this is going to last.

THE COURT: Mr. Goldberg, Ms. Fridegotto, in light of Mr. Lewyn's statements, I propose that we excuse him from this case. He has doubts about his ability to be fair. Any

Jury Voir Dire

1	objections to excusing Mr. Lewyn when for cause?
2	MR. GOLDBERG: No.
3	MS. FRIDEGOTTO: No.
4	THE COURT: We'll excuse you again.
5	Mr. Lopez, what I was going to ask you is rather than
6	have Mr. Lewyn brought up on cases where he labors in the same
7	vineyard, can you tell the jury administrator maybe he ought to
8	be called just if they have a criminal case, not that he wants
9	to, but call him on those and if he is to be called at all to
10	finish his commitment just on criminal cases.
11	COURTROOM DEPUTY: Yes, your Honor.
12	THE COURT: Mr. nice meeting you. Thank you again.
13	Mr. Zebatto, good morning. Tell us about yourself.
14	THE JUROR: I live in Manhattan. I own my apartment.
15	I have a two year degree from college.
16	I own a ladies apparent manufacturing company on
17	Seventh Avenue been doing that for 20 some odd years. I am
18	single.
19	I've never served as a juror.
20	I have friends that are lawyers but it wouldn't affect
21	this.
22	Let's see. Free time just with friends on the weekend
23	dinners and stuff like that.
24	And I feel I could make a fair judgment in this case
25	THE COURT: Okay. You've heard the allegations. The

Jury Voir Dire

	•		
1	allegations are denied but nothing shocking, just at face value		
2	to you or causing to you tilt just when you heard me read them		
3	one way are the other?		
4	THE JUROR: Not at all.		
5	THE COURT: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Zebatto.		
6	Mr. Docherty, good morning.		
7	THE JUROR: Good morning.		
8	I live in White Plains New York. I've lived there for		
9	about 27 or 28 years. We own our own home.		
10	I did graduate from law school.		
11	I work for the Westchester County District Attorneys		
12	and I have been there for about 27 or 28 years.		
13	THE COURT: Are you a criminal prosecutor there?		
14	THE JUROR: I am indeed. My wife is a human resources		
15	executive.		
16	I do have two children. They are both in college.		
17	I have never served a juror before.		
18	I have many friends who are attorneys or police		
19	officers.		
20	THE COURT: Judges I suppose too?		
21	THE JUROR: Yes, and judges. I have been named as a		
22	party in civil suits.		
23	Until recently I was active in youth soccer. More		
24	recently I play a little golf work around the house.		
25	I don't think there's any reason that I couldn't serve		

1	fairly or impartially.		
. 2	THE COURT: Okay. I spoke with Mr. Lewyn about the		
3	different capacity in which you've served as a juror. You		
4	fully appreciate that.		
5	THE JUROR: I do.		
6	THE COURT: You've been in the position of counsel		
7	picking juries in undoubtedly?		
8	THE JUROR: I have.		
9	THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Docherty, appreciate your		
10	answers.		
11	Oscar Navarrete.		
12	THE JUROR: Good morning.		
13	First time. I don't speak English almost, so I'll		
14	try. I live in the Bronx. I rent.		
15	I never go to school in this country.		
16	I work in hotel. I cook on the La Meridian in		
17.	Manhattan.		
18	I married. I got two kids.		
19	I never serve in jury. That was my first time.		
20	That's it.		
21	THE COURT: So you don't know anybody in the criminal		
22	justice system?		
23	THE JUROR: No.		
24	THE COURT: You've never been involved in a lawsuit as		
25	a witness or defendant or a plaintiff?		

1	THE JUROR: No.
2	THE COURT: What about this case? Can you give a fair
3	judgment to this case if you are selected?
.4	THE JUROR: I don't understand too many things cause
5	my English not so good for serving on the jury.
6	THE COURT: Okay. I am able to understand what you
7,	are saying. Have you been able to follow was has been said
8.	here or is some of it, have you been unable to comprehend some
9	of what's been said?
10	THE JUROR: No, I can't serve it.
11	THE COURT: Okay. You think that you don't speak
12.	English or understand English well enough?
1,3	THE JUROR: I understand a little bit and I can talk a
14	little bit but not so much.
15	THE COURT: You think you'll have difficulty following
16	the testimony and the proceedings?
17	THE JUROR: Yes.
18	THE COURT: Counsel, I propose that we excuse Mr?
19	Navarrete, if there is not an any objection.
20	MR. GOLDBERG: No objection.
21	MS. FRIDEGOTTO: No objection.
22	THE COURT: All right. We're going to excuse you.
23	Jose, this another case where maybe the jury
24	administrator ought to talk to Mr. Navarrete if he feels

uncomfortable with his comprehension of English, then maybe we

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1		shouldn't	keep	him here.
---	--	-----------	------	-----------

COURTROOM DEPUTY: Okay.

THE COURT: Mr. Navarrete, I am going to excuse you. If you go back to the jury room the clerk here is going to let the jury administrator know, they'll talk to you a little bit about whether you should be called out on other cases. are not completely conversive with English then it is going to be a problem in any case, so thank you.

> THE JUROR: Okay. Thanks.

THE COURT: Mr. Montalio.

THE JUROR: I live in the south Bronx all my life. family owned their own home. I graduated four years in college.

> What was your degree in? THE COURT:

THE JUROR: Cooking.

THE COURT: Okay.

THE JUROR: I have no kids. Single. Never served on Don't know nobody in the justice system. I play baseball and I would serve jury.

THE COURT: Okay. What do you do for a living at the present time?

THE JUROR: I am unemployed.

THE COURT: Your last job what were you doing?

I was in school. I just graduated. THE JUROR:

THE COURT: All right. When you last had a job when

7 II 646	1	eve
----------	---	-----

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

1.6

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

er that was --

THE JUROR: I was an intern at a restaurant. 2

THE COURT: Have you ever been a party to a lawsuit of any kind or been a witness or a plaintiff or a defendant in a case?

> THE JUROR: No.

THE COURT: Okay. How about contacts with the justice system, lawyers or judges or anything? You heard me read what the allegations are, what is at issue in this case. Plaintiffs have made allegations. The defendants denied those. Can you fairly judge a case that involves these issues?

> THE JUROR: Yes.

Thank you. Appreciate your answers. THE COURT:

Ms. Breakenridge.

THE JUROR: I've lived in New Rochelle all my life.

THE COURT: Keep your voice up.

I live in New Rochelle all my life. I THE JUROR: graduated from high school and I've done some college. Haven't graduated yet.

Do for a living? Currently I am working for Cerebral Palsy in Westchester.

THE COURT: What is the nature of your work for in relation to cerebral palsy?

THE JUROR: I work with the mentally disabled, like I help them, where they live I help them out with dressing and

1 showering and stuff like that. I am single. I have no children. 2 3 I have never served on a jury before. Yeah, I do have a couple of, I do know a couple of people in the justice 4 system, know a couple of lawyers and judges. 5 THE COURT: You think your friendship or affiliation 6 7 with lawyers or judges would affect how you judge this case if you were picked? 8 THE JUROR: No. 10 THE COURT: Okay. 11 THE JUROR: What do I do in my free time? I like to 12 I love going to church, Internet and hang out with my friends and that's about it. 13 THE COURT: They seem like pretty formal things for 14 somebody your age to be doing. You know you've heard that I 15 read off the allegations that the plaintiffs have made and I 16 17 told you that the defendants deny those allegations and you 18 heard me tell Ms. Kelly earlier that there's going to be a 19 confrontation of evidence here. There is a going to be a clash 20 of evidence and if you are picked you and other jurors are 21 going to have to listen and sort through it and decide which is 22 the truthful version and base a verdict on the truthful 23 version. Are you up to that task? THE JUROR: Yes, I am. 24

THE COURT:

That may involve listening to witnesses

1	And also work in the store shipping and receiving
. 2	department. I have been there 24 years.
3	THE COURT: What business is it?
4	THE JUROR: Shipping and receiving in a store,
5	Barney's New York.
6	THE COURT: Okay.
7	THE JUROR: That's about it. And in my free time I
8	like to go to the movies, to the casino.
9	THE COURT: Do they have casinos around here?
10	THE JUROR: No. Atlantic City.
11	THE COURT: What is your game of choice there?
12	THE JUROR: Slot machines.
13	THE COURT: Okay. You heard, as the others did, the
14	allegations that I read off, the allegations I hasten to add
15	the allegations are denied. That's why we've assembled in this
16	courtroom to have eight fair people listen to the whole case
17	and decide it. Are you up to that task?
18	THE JUROR: Yes, I am.
. 19	THE COURT: Anything about the nature of the case that
20	causes you to think I might not be completely fair, I might not
21	be able to assess both side's positions?
22	THE JUROR: No
23	THE COURT: You find yourself tilting, leaning one way
24	or the other in this case at this point?
25	THE JUROR: No.

	\cdot
1	THE COURT: Thank you, Ms. Mapp. Appreciate your
2	answers.
3	Ms. Gordon.
4	THE JUROR: I live in Westchester County Briar Cliff
5	Manor, the Rockefeller Preserve. I've lived there about 20
6	years. I rent.
7 -	Went three years in college.
. 8	I am a soap maker, I guess, for a living. Not a very
9	successful one but I am working on that. I work for myself.
10	I have a significant other who does computer repair
11	networking. I have no children.
12	I've never served a juror.
13	I don't have any close connections to the court.
14	My significant other went through a civil case or was
15	sued any way. When he was doing construction work the
16	construction site was damage and it was a lot of money lost.
17	THE COURT: It doesn't sound like that had anything to
18	do with the kinds of claims that are being made here,
19	completely different, right?
20	THE JUROR: Yeah.
21	THE COURT: Okay.
22	THE JUROR: Free time, I guess gardening. I am
23	interested in herbs and just learning about them.
24	To be honest, there may be a reason why I can't serve
25	fairly but I think I can I mean I'll have to say I have been

2

3

4 5

6

7 8

9

10

11

12

13 14

15

16

17

18 19

20

21

22

23

24

25

in a similar situation but --

THE COURT: To the plaintiffs?

THE JUROR: Yes.

THE COURT: Okay. So here is the question and it's not disqualifying that you have had personal experiences that maybe touches on some of the issues at all. We want people to draw on their experience and common sense and all. The only problem it would create is if you thought in your mind you'd start drifting back to what happened to you and you would let your own situation control the outcome here. That is, that you wouldn't fairly listen to the evidence presented here and make an independent judgment. Do you think --

THE JUROR: I think I could be fair but I thought I should say my own experience.

THE COURT: Okay. But let me ask it differently. experience that you had was it recent or a long time ago?

THE JUROR: It was year ago but it's something that happened and I thought I should be honest and say.

THE COURT: No, and as I said, there's no right answers. There's just honest answers. I appreciate you raising this. The concern I think that the lawyers would have is, well, okay, is it something that the residue of it continues on in your mind and you would --

THE JUROR: No, just something happened. It happens in life, just deal with it and --

3

4

5

7

8

9

10

11

12 13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: Okay. You heard Mr. Lewyn, the lawyer, who does defense work all the time saying, you know, I think I'd naturally tilt toward the defendants. Do you have any similar feeling that maybe because you have been in these shoes that at some point you'd a tilt toward the plaintiffs instinctively.

THE JUROR: No, but consciously I'd say no but I think
I should say honestly the experience I have had.

THE COURT: Okay. Here is what any judge will tell you in handling a jury in any trial. What we try to find are eight, ten, 12 people who can say, you know, I have had experiences, maybe I have had experiences that touch on the subject matter being tried but, judge, I feel pretty confident that I can exercise the mental discipline to not let my own experiences control the outcome of this case. I'll listen to the evidence I'll make a judgment on the evidence. I'll, certainly, be informed by my own experiences. You heard me say earlier, you know, one of the questions about credibility is that the way things really happen in life? I've got common sense and experience. I am going to evaluate it that way. We want you to use that experience. It's kind of a fine line where you say, well, it happened to me so it happens this is way all the time. We wouldn't want you to do that. We'd want you to listen here, make on objective decision based on the evidence that's presented here. Do you think you could do

that?

THE JUROR: I think I could but I still wanted you to know my experience.

THE COURT: No. I get it and I appreciate it. That's just right that you would tell us about that. But I don't want to put words in your mouth. What I hear you saying thought is that you've thought this through. You are pretty confident that you can judge this case on the facts that will be presented here. Have I got it right?

THE JUROR: Yes.

THE COURT: Thank you very much.

Stephanie Feyne.

THE JUROR: Yes.

THE COURT: Good morning.

THE JUROR: Good morning. Okay. I live in Manhattan.

I have been here nor 22 years. We own our home.

I am back in school getting a masters in linguistic anthropology.

THE COURT: What does that concern?

THE JUROR: Exactly. It's language in context. I work as a sign language interpreter so I am interested in how all that comes together. I've been doing that for 32 years. I have a part-time job with the Board of Ed. I also interpret free-lance which includes medical, educational and also some legal. Most of the interpreting I've done in the legal arena

1	has been state and federal but criminal or family. I haven't
2	interpreted any civil.
3	THE COURT: Okay. So, this would be hearing impaired
4	people and you will sign the, okay, the proceedings?
5	THE JUROR: Um-hmm.
6	THE COURT: All right.
7	THE JUROR: My husband is a musician. We have no
8	children.
9	And the last time I was a juror was 35 years ago but
10	we did come to a verdict.
11	THE COURT: You must have been six years old.
12	THE JUROR: I love you.
13	THE COURT: Was the case at all similar to what is at
14	issue here?
15	THE JUROR: No. It was a paternity suit.
16	THE COURT: Okay. You heard me put the question to
17	one of the other perspective jurors about judging credibility.
18	In this case you should be prepared for an inevitable
19	confrontation of facts and sides and if you are selected and
20	seven others will have to sort through this, make sense of it
21	and say, here is what we believe the accurate version to be and
. 22	here is our verdict based on findings of fact. Can you do
23	that?
24	THE JUROR: Yes, sir.
25	THE COURT: It's not coincidental that the jury box is

:	1
:	2
:	3
4	4
!	5
1	6
	7
	8
	9
1	0
1:	1
1:	2
1	3
1	4
1	5
1	6
1.	7
1	8
1	9
2	0
2	1
2	2
2	3

25

located very, very close to the witness stand. One of the instructions I'll give you says, in judging credibility one of the things that you should pay attention to is the manner in which a person testifies, not just what they say but the manner in which they testify. Often, I know this, you probably know this from human experience that sometimes a no can mean yes. I've raised two sons and I have had them shake their head no to me and I knew that the answer was really yes. The same phenomena occurs here in court. And you may know that from your experiences as an interpreter watching somebody, watching the manner looking for non verbal clues is a very big part of judging and getting to proper judgments, correct judgments about credibility. Are you up to that task if you are selected here?

THE JUROR: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: Okay. Finally, let me put to you the question that I've put to many others. You've heard the allegations. The allegations are denied. Can you give both parties here a fair trial, a level playing field?

THE JUROR: Yes.

THE COURT: OK. Thank you very much. Appreciate your answers.

Ms. Reed.

THE JUROR: Yes.

THE COURT: Good morning.

1	THE JUROR: Good morning. I live in the Bronx. My
2	husband and I have lived there for over 20 years. We rent. I
. 3	finished high school. I am attending art college at home. I
4	work for the police department as an administrative aid.
5	THE COURT: How long have you done that, Ms. Reed?
6	THE JUROR: 28 years.
7	THE COURT: Do your duties ever call on you to come to
8	court or to testify, anything like that?
9	THE JUROR: No.
10	THE COURT: Okay.
11	THE JUROR: I am married.
12	My spouse is retired. He used to work as a New York
13	City Housing maintenance man.
1.4	We have two children.
15	No, I have not served as a juror.
16	I don!t have any close friends who are judges or
17	relatives lawyers or police officers.
·18	My brother was in a lawsuit. He was hit by a car but
19	it's been settled.
20	THE COURT: Was that quite a while ago?
21	THE JUROR: Yes. It's been a long time. ,
22	THE COURT: Doesn't sound like that would influence
23	you in any way in this case.
24	THE JUROR: It would not.
25	I like to listen to music. I like to go by cycling.

1	I like to read. I like to play sports, handball.
2	Organization, I attend church regularly.
3	And there is no reason why I can't make a fair
4	judgment on this case
5	THE COURT: Okay. You've heard particular questions
6	I've asked the other perspective jurors before you. The last
7	statement that you just made to me, no reason that you can't be
.8	fair in this case, do you make that statement mindful of all
9	the questions I've put to others?
10	THE JUROR: Yes.
11	THE COURT: Okay. Thank you very much.
12	Neda Khatamee?
13	THE JUROR: Yes. I live in Manhattan. I have been
14	living here for about 14 years. I own my home.
15	I graduated law school. Practiced law for about five
16	years.
17	THE COURT: What was the nature of your practice,
18	Ms. Khatamee?
19	THE JUROR: Corporate.
20	THE COURT: Okay.
21	THE JUROR: What I do now, my present employer is a
22	Major Lindsey & Africa. We're legal recruiters. I have been
23	doing that for about five years with them.
24	I am single. I have no children.
25	I've never served on a jury.

1	Most of my friends are lawyers.
2	THE COURT: Do you have lawyers that practice in the
3	specialty of our two counsel?
4	THE JUROR: Yes, friends. But I also work with
5	lawyers.
6.	THE COURT: Okay. Do you think you would tilt one way
. 7	or the other or are you open?
8	THE JUROR: I am open.
9	THE COURT: Okay.
10	THE JUROR: I like playing golf. I go to the ballet
11	and opera.
12	THE COURT: Where is the closest golf course here.
13	Ladies and gentlemen, I guess I haven't mentioned this
14	to some of you. You may pick it up either from the way I speak
15	but I am not from here. I am a visiting judge from San Diego.
16	Land is at a premium it seems to me. Where is the closest golf
17	course?
18	THE JUROR: The winter times I go down to Florida and
19	in the summers I play up in the Berkshires usually.
20	THE COURT: Okay.
21	THE JUROR: And I believe I can serve fairly.
22	THE COURT: Okay. I put this question to the other
23	lawyers in the group. You are not here as a lawyer, of course,
24	or a legal recruiter. You are here as a citizen of the
25	Southern District of New York and they want you to judge this

1	case with your citizen's hat on. It sounds like you are
2	prepared to do that.
3	THE JUROR: Yes.
4	THE COURT: Thank you. Appreciate your answers.
5	Good morning, Mr. We.
6	THE JUROR: I live in White Plains almost eight years.
7	I am ophthalmologist eye doctor. And my wife is office
.8	manager. I have two kids, one boy and one girl.
9	THE COURT: Are they employed, your children? Are
10	they young or old enough to be employed?
11	THE JUROR: My boy is ophthalmologist too. And I
12	practice in Flushing and I am going to retire end of this year
13	and I am 68 years old.
14	THE COURT: Okay. Is your daughter employed also?
15	THE JUROR: Yes, designer.
16	THE COURT: Okay.
17	THE JUROR: My daughter.
18	THE COURT: Okay.
19	THE JUROR: I don't know any judge, anyone of these
20	people.
21	THE COURT: You know a lot of ophthalmologists I bet
22	but no, judges or lawyers.
23	THE JUROR: Yes. But my English is limited.
24	THE COURT: Okay. Have you been able to follow the
25	proceedings, follow what I've said so far?
	1

Jury Voir Dire

1	THE JUROR: My concern is I have two, my brain have a
2	surgery, my brain twice. And I take many medications and
3	include the Dilantin to control my seizure.
4	THE COURT: Okay. Do you think that that would pose a
5	be problem for you sitting four or five days?
6	THE JUROR: I doubt because I can't control my emotion
7	and I tends to seizure.
8	THE COURT: Okay. Do you think there is anything
· 9	about being part of a trial that would bring that on or cause
10	that to be more frequent than normal?
11	THE JUROR: I don't know.
12	THE COURT: Let me ask you this, do you feel under
13	stress just from having to answer the questions or be a part of
14	this process?
15	THE JUROR: I think so.
16	THE COURT: All right. Well, maybe, Mr. Goldberg and
17	Ms. Fridge, it might be that rather than put Mr. Wu through
18	that, if you are in agreement, I propose that we excuse him for
19	cause. Is there any objection?
20	MR. GOLDBERG: No objection.
21	MS. FRIDEGOTTO: No objection, your Honor.
22	THE COURT: All right. Mr. Wu, I think rather than
23	test this given what you've told me that we'll excuse you from
24	jury service here.

THE JUROR: Thank you.

1	THE COURT: You can just leave your questionnaire on
2	the chair, Mr. Wu. Nice meeting you.
3	Mr. Miller.
4	THE JUROR: Good morning, your Honor, begging your
5	pardon, I would normal take off the glasses and visor but I do
6	have a medicine medical reason.
7	THE COURT: Okay.
8	THE JUROR: I don't know if that will be an issue or
9	not.
10	THE COURT: Okay. Not as far as I'm concerned. You
11	have to tell me whether you think it might be.
12	THE JUROR: I don't believe so.
13	THE COURT: Okay. Are you able to see what is going
14	on here in court?
15	THE JUROR: Of course.
16	THE COURT: I know at some point Mr. Goldberg and,
17	perhaps, Ms. Fridegotto, Mr. Goldberg in particular, has shown
18	me a chart with some numbers on it. I think he is going to
19	have some blow-ups here. Circumstantial evidence tells me that
20	at some point that the contents of that wrapped package against
. 21	the wall are going to be opened and displayed to the jury but
22	have you no problem seeing around the courtroom?
23	THE JUROR: No.
24	THE COURT: Okay. Thank you for that explanation but
25	I am happy to hear from you.

1	THE JUROR: Want to make sure I'd be no disrespect.
2	I've lived in Manhattan for about 30 years. I'm
3	originally from upstate New York. I rent. I live in Greenwich
4	Village.
5	associates degree in schooling. I've worked for Con
6	Edison as an electronics electrician
7	THE COURT: What was the name of the business?
8	THE JUROR: Consolidated Edison. I work as an
9	electronics technician. I have been there for about 22 years
10	now.
11	I am single. I am non custodial parent of a 16 year
12	old boy.
13	I have been through the jury selection process a
14	couple of times but I've never gone the full distance through
15	the commencement of the trial.
16	THE COURT: You have not been picked to sit on an
17	actual jury then?
18	THE JUROR: Yeah, through it's entirety.
19	THE COURT: Okay.
20	THE JUROR: Nobody I know closely, at least, or that I
21	know works in the justice system. I ride a motorcycle quite a
22	bit. I am a musician, guitarist.
23	And I did have a motorcycle accident in 2001 and we
24	finally settled in 2006
25	THE COURT: Was the case like a hard fought case that

	·
1 .	the case to get a settlement on that?
2	THE JUROR: Not particularly. The proceedings lasted,
3	approximately, three and a half days before the defending
4	lawyer finally offered an acceptable
5	THE COURT: Okay. Were you actually in trial on the
6	matter then?
7	THE JUROR: I believe that's what you would call it,
8	yeah.
9	THE COURT: Either a trial or arbitration?
10	THE JUROR: Yeah. There was a jury selected and
11	hearing testimony and all that kind of stuff.
12	THE COURT: Okay.
13	THE JUROR: I don't see any reason that I wouldn't be
14	able to serve fairly in this case.
15	THE COURT: All right. Mr. Miller, thank you. I
16	appreciate your answers.
17	Let's see. Mr. Rowe, now I am maybe mistaken,
18	Mr. Rowe. Were you called up earlier this week too? You look
19	like a fellow that was called up.
20	THE JUROR: Yes, a couple days ago.
21	THE COURT: I never got to you in the questioning.
22	Welcome again.
23	THE JUROR: Thank you, sir.
24	I live in Manhattan around 40 years. Live in rent

apartment because I never bought the house. I have a reason

1	for that. I have a one son. I raised, my friend told me
2	raised in the city. Now he is a college kid (inaudible).
3	I am retired. Before retire I have my own business
4	over 35 years.
5	THE COURT: What was your business?
6	THE JUROR: Food enterprise, retail and at the Madison
7	Avenue, 83rd Street.
8	THE COURT: Did you attend school yourself?
9	THE JUROR: I run myself everything. I have three
10	store but after 9/11 I have to close
11.	THE COURT: Oh.
12	THE JUROR: most of them and I moved to the Third
13	Avenue, wrong place, wrong time, so I closed that too.
14	THE COURT: All right. You've been a business man for
15	a long time. Did you go to school here?
16	THE JUROR: No. I study music at Korea.
.17	THE COURT: Okay. I think we're at question 6.
18	THE JUROR: Yes. I have my wife. She is teaching the
19	kindergarten.
20	THE COURT: Okay. You've already mentioned you have a
21	son who is in culinary school, is that what you said or hotel
22	management?
23	THE JUROR: Yes.
24	THE COURT: He is in his third year?
25	THE JUROR: Yeah, a junior.

1	THE COURT: How about prior jury service, have you
2	ever served as a juror?
3	THE JUROR: Yeah, I've been serving as a coroner's
4	juror.
5	THE COURT: How long ago was that?
6	THE JUROR: I think about four or five year ago.
7	THE COURT: What about a civil case or a criminal
8	case. Have you sat on one of those?
9	THE JUROR: Civil case I never did.
10	THE COURT: Do you know lawyers or judges or police
11	officers?
12	THE JUROR: When have you a business you have to know
13	the lawyers. First thing have you to know the real estate
14	lawyer, litigation lawyer, all kind of lawyer.
15	THE COURT: Okay.
16	THE JUROR: And you have to be friends to them.
17	THE COURT: Have you ever been in a lawsuit? Have you
18	been a plaintiff or a defendant or a witness in a case?
19	THE JUROR: No.
20	THE COURT: Never have, okay. What do you do to enjoy
21	yourself? What do you do in your free time?
22	THE JUROR: I watch HBO Bill Maher.
23	THE COURT: Okay.
24	THE JUROR: And Comedy Central John Stewart.
25	THE COURT: Hobbies, you have hobbies?

THE JUROR: Yeah. I listen to music.

THE COURT: Okay. You've heard the questions I've asked about this particular case. Is there anything that you've heard me say about this case or anything in the allegations, if you get picked can you serve fairly and give a fair judgment?

THE JUROR: Sure.

THE COURT: Thank you. I appreciate your answers.

Mr. Sacco?

THE JUROR: Yes. Before I forget, your Honor, walk

THE JUROR: Yes. Before I forget, your Honor, walk over the Brooklyn Bridge stop on the number four and get off at the Mosholu Parkway. You are a 20 minute walk away from the Van Cortlandt Public Golf Course which is one of the oldest golf courses in the country. You can just bring your clubs right on the subway and be right there.

THE COURT: Mr. Sacco, I hesitate to tell you all of you this but I gave it up about 25 years ago. I was a club thrower. I went out with my dad and my brother and they said never again. They are, said you are an embarrassment to us. You are throwing clubs and cursing. So I gave up.

THE JUROR: It sounded like you might be looking. You don't have to go all the way to Florida.

I live in northern Westchester County in a town called South Salem. I have been there for at last ten years. Prior to that I was here in the city. I am a life long New Yorker.

2

3

4

5

6 7

8

9

10

11

12 13

14

15

16

17

18 19

20

21

22

23

24

25

I share ownership of my house with bank.

I am a doctor. Went to medical school here in the city at Mount Sinai.

THE COURT: What is your specialty.

I specialize in hospice and palliative THE JUROR: I work with patients mostly at the end of life. I medicine. am at Bronx Lebanon Hospital where I have been for the last 18 years. And I, in fact, do have a concern in that regard that's not, specifically, related to my qualification as a juror but I would like your permission to bring that up to you if possible.

> THE COURT: Sure.

THE JUROR: I have been working for the last several months on opening an inpatient hospice unit for our patients at the hospital. We did actually just opened that unit this week and it's now filled with patients and I am, unfortunately, I am the only physician at the hospital who is boarded in the specialty and I am responsible for their care.

You might legitimately ask how is that I allowed that to happened when I was called for jury duty some time in And the answer to that question is that it's been on and off as to whether or not this unit would open

> THE COURT: I am certain.

The opening was uncertain and my hospital THE JUROR: administration typically said we've done as much as we can to delay the opening of this. When can you get it done?

on Tuesday.

THE COURT: Okay. That is important stuff and here is what I would propose and let me see if counsel will agree. It is important that we have conscientious and well spoken people like you on the jury. If we were to postpone your service so that you can get things underway and deal with the pressures of the moment you would have to come back and finish this service, could you do you that?

THE JUROR: May I add, sir, that I take my responsibility as a juror very seriously.

THE COURT: Oh, I am sure.

THE JUROR: I would happily defer my service.

THE COURT: You are here today in the midst of what's he going on tells me that you do take it very seriously.

Counsel, have any objection given the peculiar time problems that Dr. Sacco that we release him from the service today and deferred his service to some time once he has got matters organized and in hand?

MR. GOLDBERG: No objection.

MS. FRIDEGOTTO: No objection.

THE COURT: Okay. Doctor, very nice meeting you.

Good luck with that. Sounds like a very important thing that you are doing. We'll defer your service.

Mr. Lopez, would you give appropriate instructions to Dr. Sacco and the jury administrator?

1	COURTROOM DEPUTY: Yes, your Honor.
2	THE COURT: All right. That brings us to Ms. Daley.
3	Margaret Daley, good morning.
4	THE JUROR: I live in Westchester, Yonkers. I rent.
5	I did not go to school in this country. I work as a certified
6.	nurse's aid at a nursing home, Regency Extended Nursing Home.
7	THE COURT: Mr. Lopez, do we have a mic?
8	COURTROOM DEPUTY: I think that she can maybe step up
9	to the lectern. Your voice is dropping off a little bit and
. 10	the court reporter around I are having some difficulty. You
11	have a small voice and this a big room.
12	I got the first part. I know you live in Westchester,
13	Yonkers. You are a nurse and go on from there if you would.
14	You are presently employed?
15	THE JUROR: Yes.
16	THE COURT: Are you married?
17	THE JUROR: No. I didn't marry. I have two children.
18	I did not serve on a jury
19	THE COURT: Tell me in about your children. Are they
20	adults?
21	THE JUROR: Yes.
22	THE COURT: What do they do for a living?
23	THE JUROR: One of them is a manager for a store and
24	one of them is a certified nurse's aid.
25	THE COURT: Okay. Do you have any connection to the

1	court system? Do you	know lawyers or judges, anything like
2	that?	
3	THE JUROR:	Yeah. My mom have a lawsuit.
4	THE COURT:	Your mom is involved a lawsuit now?
5	THE JUROR:	Yes.
6	THE COURT:	Generally speaking, what is the nature of
7	the lawsuit that she	is involved in?
8	THE JUROR:	She fell.
9	THE COURT:	Okay. So a personal injury case?
10	THE JUROR:	Yes.
11	THE COURT:	She is trying to get damages for her
12	injuries?	
13	THE JUROR:	Yeah.
14	THE COURT:	OK. Were you involved? Were you a
15	witness to that at al	.1?
16	THE JUROR:	Yeah.
17	THE COURT:	You witnessed it?
18	THE JUROR:	Yeah.
19	THE COURT:	You are going to be called as a witness,
20	do you expect?	
21	THE JUROR:	Yeah.
22	THE COURT:	Okay. How long before the case goes to
23	trial, do you have an	ny idea?
24	THE JUROR:	No, I don't.
25	THE COURT:	Okay. Do you think, Ms. Daley, that the
l		

(Pause)

Jury Voir Dire

fact that your mother is in a lawsuit and you are going to be a
witness do you think that that might interfere with your able
to fairly judge this particular case?
THE JUROR: Maybe.
THE COURT: It doesn't sound like a personal injury
case is anything like what is alleged here. The claims here
are very, very different. So it doesn't immediately occur to
me that there would be any connection but I just wonder if
knowing that you are going to be a witness, if maybe that will
come into your mind or do you think that that would influence
you at all in deciding this case? What do you think?
THE JUROR: Sometimes I have to go with the lawyer so
I don't know.
THE COURT: Okay. So I am catching you off guard here
I know because you didn't anticipate any of this but let me ask
you this, what about the allegations? You've heard me read the
allegations is there anything about that that shocks you or
that causes you to think you might favor one side or the other
side automatically?
THE JUROR: Yeah.
THE COURT: You do think you might favor one side or
the other?
THE JUROR: (Nodding). (Shrugging).

THE JUROR: My hobbies, I like to cook and I like to

1 go shopping malls.

THE COURT: I want to come back to one question. I am not sure you understood what I was asking. You heard when I read what this case is about, right?

THE JUROR: Yeah.

THE COURT: But the plaintiffs are essentially claiming they were discriminated against and there's other claims and defendants deny those claims. Do you think you can judge those claims fairly or do you think that you might favor one side or the other?

THE JUROR: Maybe.

THE COURT: You don't know.

THE JUROR: (Shaking her head).

THE COURT: All right. Well, I think given

Ms. Daley's indecision about whether she can fairly judge the

claims I would propose that she be excused for cause unless

counsel have an objection.

Mr. Goldberg, you can follow-up if you have any additional questions

MR. GOLDBERG: Could I ask her?

THE COURT: Yes, of course.

MR. GOLDBERG: Ms. Daley, do you feel that you could, if you were picked, do you feel you could sit, listen to the evidence and make a decision on the case based on the evidence that is presented in this litigation, this lawsuit?

1	THE JUROR: (Nodding).
2	THE COURT: All right. Ms. Fridegotto, you may
3	inquire also.
4	MS. FRIDEGOTTO: Thank you.
5	You do not have to tell us what it is that has you
6	thinking that maybe, but do you think that you could I don't
` 7	know how to put this. Do you think that you could approach the
8	case with a clean slate and then see where the evidence takes
9	you and only make a decision once all the evidence has been
10	presented to you or do you feel that just starting off straight
11	off the bat you tend to already have, I guess, some ideas
12	regarding which way the case is going to go based on anything
13	that you might feel?
14	THE JUROR: Yeah. (Nodding).
15	THE COURT: All right. Thank you, Ms. Daley.
16	We'll leave Ms. Daley for now. You may have your seat
17	back.
18	Mr. Loperena, good morning.
19	THE JUROR: No problem. I live in the Bronx, New
20	York. I rent the apartment.
21	I just graduated from Apex Technical School to be an
22	auto technician.
23	THE COURT: Okay.
24	THE JUROR: I am unemployed right now because I just
25	graduated. My present employer was actually Duane Reade which

1	was like two years ago.
2	THE COURT: What kind of business is Duane Reade?
3	THE JUROR: That's a drug store. It's like Walgreen's
4	but it's only in New York.
5	THE COURT: That's why I had to ask you, I guess.
6	THE JUROR: I am single. I don't have any children.
7	I never served as a juror. I'd love to.
8	I don't have no close connection with any judges,
9 ·	lawyers or anything
10	THE COURT: Okay.
11	THE JUROR: My free time I like to work on my '96
12	Honda Accord.
13	No, I don't think I judge everything fairly.
14	THE COURT: You are not tilting one way or the other
15	just on hearing what we've discussed so far?
16	THE JUROR: Not at all.
17	THE COURT: Let me follow-up with you. I don't have
18	special concerns about you so I am speaking to everybody here
19	but I want to make this point.
20	If you are picked to sit on this case you can't talk
21	about it with anybody.
22	THE JUROR: No, I understand.
23	THE COURT: And what I will tell the jurors is that
24	you have like a girlfriend or somebody you hang out with?
25	THE JUROR: No.

THE COURT:

Friends?

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13 14

15

16

17

18

19

20 21

22

23

24

25

THE JUROR: Friends, yeah.

Well, if you go back tonight and your THE COURT: friends say, hey, you got picked for this jury. Tell us about You've got to say, I can't tell you anything. All I can say is it's a civil case and it's supposed to last three or four days. At the end once we have reached a verdict I'll give you a blow-by-blow account but not until then. That's what you got to say. Are you willing to do that?

THE JUROR: Definitely.

THE COURT: Here is another rule and this seems a little curious. You can't even talk to the other people that are serving on the jury with you about the case until the case is submitted to you for a decision.

You ever watch that program Survivor?

THE JUROR: No.

THE COURT: There's a program, they put all these people on an island.

THE JUROR: No, I heard of it.

THE COURT: I don't watch it either but I understand that what they do is they make little deals with each other and they say, we are going to vote to kick off this guy. Then we are going to form these things called coalitions. Jury service is not like Survivor. Jurors don't form coalitions. They wait until the end and everybody discusses the evidence. After

everything's been said and done, you've heard from the lawyers,

1 2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24 25

THE JUROR: I live in Manhattan. I've lived there my

entire life, upper west side 40 years. I rent my apartment.

you've heard the instructions, you've head all of the evidence in the case and, importantly, you've heard from your fellow jurors, that's when you make up your mind in any case. But in

this case in particular can you wait until then and keep an

THE JUROR: Absolutely.

open mind until the very end?

THE COURT: Now, what I am asking you will be sounding it is contrary to human nature because we form impressions as we process information. Somebody will take and say something and we'll say that makes me think this. And this instruction that I am talking about doesn't forbid you from forming impressions. It just says, exercise the mental discipline to say to yourself, I am not going to decide which way I am voting until I've heard everything and my fellow jurors have given me their perspectives. Maybe I've missed something. I am open to listening to what other people have to say. Only then will I makeup my mind on how I am going to vote. You want to sit on this case, if you get to sit on this case can you follow that rule?

> THE JUROR: Absolutely.

Thank you. Appreciate your answers. THE COURT:

Finally, Mr. Cohen. Thank you for being patient.

SOUTHERN DISTRICT REPORTERS, P.C. (212) 805-0300

1	I graduated from high school and from college and from
2	business school. In college I studied sociology. In business
3	school, finance.
4	I'm a real estate dealer. I'm a partner with a
5	developer on a project. My present employer I'm essentially
6	self-employed. I'm in a partnership. That's two years now.
7	I am single, not married. I don't have any children.
8 .	I have serves as a juror on a civil case. We did
9	reach a verdict three years ago.
10	THE COURT: What kind of case?
11	THE JUROR: Malpractice.
12	THE COURT: Okay.
13	THE JUROR: My father's an attorney, maritime law
14	practice.
· 15	THE COURT: Is he still in practice?
16	THE JUROR: Yes.
17	THE COURT: Do you know other lawyers, friends of your
18	father?
19	THE JUROR: Many.
20	THE COURT: Any of the lawyers are well acquainted do
21	the kind of work that counsel in this case are doing,
22	employment work?
23	THE JUROR: No. Most are corporate law.
24	THE COURT: Okay.
25	THE JUROR: My free time exercise, read, socialize

with friends and family.

2

buffed out.

4

3

THE JURO

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12 13

14.

15

16

17

18

19

20

22

21

23

24

25

i friends and family.

THE COURT: You look like you are pretty trim and out.

THE JUROR: Very kind, sir.

THE COURT: What about this case? Now you've heard the questions that I've asked all the other perspective jurors. Incidentally, would you have given significantly different answers to the one that has been given by anybody who still remains here as part of the perspective jury?

THE JUROR: No, your Honor.

THE COURT: Can you fairly judge this case? You know what the allegations are? You now know the allegations are denied. Can you sit, listen and make a judgment and tell the parties, here the accurate version, here is the consensus version of the eight of us that are conscientious that you chose to decide this case and here is our verdict based on that; can you do that?

THE JUROR: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Thank you very much, Mr. Cohen.

All right. That concludes the questioning. Counsel, are there any challenges for cause that you want to make at sidebar?

MS. FRIDEGOTTO: Would it be possible to have five minutes, your Honor?

THE COURT: Yes. At this point I am just asking if

	•
1	you want to make a challenge for cause. If there are no
2	challenges for cause then I'll have Mr. Lopez give you the
3	sheets, Ms. Fridge.
4	MS. FRIDEGOTTO: Yes, there will be challenges.
5	THE COURT: Okay. You have a challenge for cause?
6	MS. FRIDEGOTTO: Please. Okay. I'll see both
7	principal counsel at sidebar.
8	(Continued on next page)
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

(Sidebar)

MS. FRIDEGOTTO: I wanted to challenge number 10. I am very concerned about the issues regarding the fact that she had had prior experience regarding this type of case. I would not want to be make her feel uncomfortable and have to disclose what the exact nature of it might be, so that might be related or because she is a woman and therefore I would like to challenge her just because of that.

MR. GOLDBERG: My sense is that she can judge the case and that she is trying very hard to serve and so I think that she has thought about it and because if she didn't say she could feel that she could do the job I would not be inclined to agree to that, I would think she's qualified.

MS. FRIDEGOTTO: One more thing, personally, I just felt that the fact that she kept bringing it up more than once and not just the initial time when your Honor was questioning her that is what would lead me to believe that it would possibly and I don't think it would be intentional doing, I just feel she would be inputting a little bit of her personal experiences and that was the why she kept bringing it up.

THE COURT: Okay. The Court denies the challenge for cause, inquired extensively of Ms. Gordon. I tend to think that she is just being very conscientious. I gave a preamble type instruction of why I explained and where I regarded her answer as an attempt to be very conscientious to say, look,

there was something in my background the lawyers ought to know. I asked her several times whether she could distinguish between evidence that she'd hear in a case and what had happened to her and I asked her whether she would allow no require involvement, what she was involved with to control the outcome here. She clearly said no. So I don't see a -- for excusing her for cause.

Next?

MS. FRIDEGOTTO: This is, the issue is with number 18.

I'm not exactly sure that she understands English.

THE COURT: I agree. I see a big, big language problem with her and I am inclined to excuse her for cause.

MR. GOLDBERG: I think that's what it was, language barrier.

THE COURT: I think there will be a problem comprehending the evidence. Here is what I'll do. She is discussed for cause. Just scratch her off the list. I am not going to tell her she's excused for cause. We will let her go with everybody else when we excuse the rest of the jurors but you can assume Ms. Daley is excused for cause. She was clearly trying but I could tell she just wasn't comprehending what she was being asked. A couple of times the answers didn't make sense.

Anything else?

MS. FRIDEGOTTO: No.

1	THE COURT: We will give you time. I am going to pass
2	the list out. I am not going to ask you to instantaneously
3	exercise challenges. That's it?
4	MR. GOLDBERG: Yes.
5	MS. FRIDEGOTTO: Yes.
6	(Continued on next page)
7	
8	
9 .	
LO	
11	
12	
L3 14	
15 .	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21 .	
22	
23	
24	
25	

(In Open Court)

THE COURT: All right. The Court has entertained challenges for cause from counsel at sidebar. At this time,

Mr. Lopez -- actually counsel have the list.

COURTROOM DEPUTY: I've already provided the list to counsel, your Honor.

THE COURT: This is the time for counsel to exercise their preemptory challenges and you could do so with some dispatch.

(Pause)

of what our experiences are, I've tried a lot of cases for 18 years. I've tried a lot of cases and I went through a lot of jury selection myself. I had one case where the jury selection process, this process in which we have been involved for the last hour and a half lasted three weeks. Can you imagine coming and listening to questions and having repetitive questions asked of successive jurors? Remember the old Bill Murray movie, Ground Hog Day? I'd get up every morning. The alarm clock would go off. I've a vowed to myself if I was ever in a position to affect that part of the process I would do what I could to expedite it. So the procedure that I've followed I am told is not a common one here. It is called the Arizona method. They used this method. It originated in Arizona.

4 5

The parties now have three preemptory challenges each. I require them to exercise them simultaneously and without knowing what the other guy is doing. So it's possible the lawyers to, both lawyers may excuse the same prospective juror. But it's an efficient way of picking a jury that doesn't really compromise the partys' ability to make an assessment and pick people that they want. And as I say, it usually takes about an hour and a half or an hour and 15 minutes. Much better than three weeks.

In some systems the lawyers are allowed to put questions to the jurors too. I am from California. That's sort of the order of the day there and that can go on tediously. A lot of times you find the lawyers aren't really interested in the answers. They're trying to make a point beforehand. They'll get time to advocate once the case is underway.

Incidentally, for those of you who haven't served on juries before are unfamiliar with the court process, the lawyers by the rules of the court and the contentions of the Court won't be interacting with you personally once the case is underway. You'll hear from them here in court but if you see them here during the breaks they won't talk to you. It's not because they're snotty. Both lawyers I've met, they're decent approachable people but they are following my order not to speak to prospective jurors because it looks bad if

Mr. Goldberg is seen chatting with you. Then it looks like maybe he is trying to curry favor or somebody might think you are talking about the case. So they won't do that. But take my word for it, they're decent approaching people and you'll be able to talk to them after case is all over.

I am here for two weeks. As a federal judge you can sit anywhere in the country where there's a federal court. There was a need here and there is a lot of cases here. Some of the judges had a need to have somebody come in and help them. So I took on four cases. And two of them settled once I made rulings and set some time limits. Then I tried one and this is the other. And if we finish I might even take on a fifth case.

But impetus for me coming out here is my wife hasn't been to New York and she is joining me tonight. Unfortunately, I've got to work while she is taking the tour and the Circle Line but she wanted to see New York. But this is return for me. I came here when I was in still in law school. My last semester in law school I worked for the U.S. Attorney's Office. That was 32 years ago. I lived up at Columbia University in the dorm and took the subway down every day but I spent the summer in 1978 here. Some things have changed but many things have not.

So I tell you these things to pass the time with you while the lawyers make their decisions. What we'll do is,

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

they're deciding who they want to have on this case. Once they turn in their sheets indicating their preemptory challenges Mr. Lopez will reconcile the list and we will call the names of the first eight jurors, perspective jurors, who have not been stricken and they will be the jury in this case.

In federal court whether a criminal or civil case the juries must be unanimous and in civil cases we don't have alternates. All jurors who sit and participate in the trial will deliberate at the end and be part of the process. have at least six, so I've impaneled two more than necessary. And as I said, I don't anticipate that this case is going to present a time problem for anyone. I think all of you were probably time screened too. You had an opportunity to say oh, I've got a big thing coming up. I can't serve this week. Is that accurate?

(Pause)

THE COURT: Once the list is ready counsel will have an opportunity to see it before we call the names and make any objections. If there are any to the list I'll hear those.

Folks, those of you in the jury box if I could ask that you take a seat in the gallery or just any where else in the courtroom. This will avoid people having to step over each other when we do call the names of those who have been selected.

(Pause)

1	THE COURT: All right. Mr. Lopez, you've reconcile
2	the lists?
3	COURTROOM DEPUTY: Yes, your Honor.
4	THE COURT: Counsel, if you'll take a look at the
5	board that the clerk has.
6	(Pause)
7	THE COURT: Inform me, please, whether your peremptory
8	challenges are accurately reflected.
. 9	(Pause)
10	MS. FRIDEGOTTO: No, they're not, your Honor, because
11	one of the people that I've challenged is still listed.
12	THE COURT: Okay. All right.
13	(Pause)
14	THE COURT: Mr. Goldberg, you may approach to make
15	sure that your peremptories are
16	(Pause)
17	(Continued on next page)
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
	·

THE COURT: All right, counsel have had an opportunity 1 to look at the list as reconciled. 2 3 Mr. Goldberg, does the reconciled list accurately 4 reflect the challenges issued by the plaintiffs? 5 MR. GOLDBERG: Yes, your Honor. THE COURT: Ms. Fridegotto, does the list accurately 6 7 reflect your challenges on behalf of defendants? MS. FRIDEGOTTO: 8 Yes. 9 THE COURT: Is there any objection by either party to 10 the list as reconciled? MR. GOLDBERG: No, your Honor. 11 12 MS. FRIDEGOTTO: No, your Honor. THE COURT: Call the names. 13 If your name is called, come back to the jury box. 14 15 THE CLERK: Juror number 1, Cato Jones. 16 Number 2, Robert Docherty. 17 Juror number 3, Viola Mapp. Juror number 4, Linda Reed. 18 19 Juror number 5, Steven Miller. 20 Juror number 6, Jai Hwan Rowe. 21 Juror number 7, Milton Loperena. Juror number 8, Daniel Cohen. 22 23 Those jurors whose names I did not call, I am just 24 going to ask you to report to the courtroom right across the 25 hallway and I will be there very shortly.

25

1 THE COURT: Hold on one second. 2 I want to address you before you leave. 3 Mr. Goldberg, Ms. Fridegotto, are these the ladies and 4 gentlemen you have chosen to try your case? 5 MR. GOLDBERG: Yes, your Honor. MS. FRIDEGOTTO: Yes, your Honor. 6 7 THE COURT: Folks, those who were not called I want to thank you. It has been my pleasure to meet you. Thank you for 8 9 coming today. This is important stuff. As you heard me say, 10 if you were in the position of the plaintiffs or the defendants you would want conscientious people like yourself to be 11 12 available to serve and to judge this matter and to reach a 13 conclusion. .14 Thank you. My great pleasure to meet all of you. 15 You are excused. 16 (Prospective jurors excused) 17 THE COURT: This is the last time it is going to seem a little like church, but if you will all stand and raise your 18 19 right hand, we will swear you in as the jurors in this case. 20 (A jury panel was duly sworn.) 21 THE COURT: Ladies and gentlemen, I am going to give you a few preliminary instructions in this case before we take 22 23 our lunch break, and I assume we will break at about twelve. 24 Let me talk to you about logistics going forward now

that you are the jury in this case.

We will take a 15 minute break, this is starting Monday of course because we already subsumed the morning today. In the afternoon we will start at one and we will go until five and we will take a 15 minute break in the afternoon as well. You will have an hour for lunch.

I am informed that if there is a line trying to come into the court house, if you tell the court security officer that you are a sitting juror and that you need to get through the line, they will move you to the front, you won't have to stand in line. Please do that. That will insure that the hour we give you is adequate for you to get something to eat and make it back here.

We move at the pace of the slowest ship in the convey, so what that means is if one of you is not here we can't start.

Please come on time. Allow a little extra time to get here in the morning and be mindful of the time during the breaks. As I said, I want to manage your time efficiently, so if you are all here we can start, if you are not we can't.

Last week I made the same speech and unfortunately we got somebody who was 20 minutes late and all her fellow jurors were the box, the dapper court reporter was here ready to tap the keys and I was waiting and the juror was very embarrassed to have to come in and make excuses why she was late and kept everybody waiting.

I don't do that intentionally, I don't revel in it, but do be mindful we start and end on time and it is a courtesy for fellow jurors to be here on time.

I want to give you some preliminary instructions before I send you on your first break. These instructions will be preliminary, kind of broad strokes, about burden of proof and some of the things that you probably should know before you start hearing evidence, which will occur this afternoon.

At the end of the case I will give you further instructions, more specific instructions and, in fact, I will give you a packet of instructions about this case that will go back with you when you deliberate the case so you will have them to refer to during your discussions and deliberations.

Ladies and gentlemen, you are now the jury in this case and it is my duty to instruct you on the law.

You are not to infer from these instructions who are anything that I say or do during the course of the trial that I have any opinion about what the evidence is or what verdict you should reach. The parties have the option of waiving their right to a jury and having me decide the case. They did not opt to do that. They want a consensus decision from people drawn from the community. I don't feel badly about that at all. It is their absolute right and I understand why they would exercise it.

I tell you that so that you don't read into anything

1.4

21.

that I say and I try not to say or do anything that indicates I have an interest in the outcome or that your verdict should be one way or the other, but I don't, I don't, so if you think I'm leaning one way, you are misapprehending things. It's up to the twelve of you have. You are going to be the judges of the facts in in case. You are going to say what happened here and what the outcome should be.

It is your duty as jurors to find the facts from all the evidence in this case and then to those facts as you kind they will you apply the law as I give it to you.

You have to follow the law as I give it whether you agree with it or not. In deciding this case you must put aside subjective factors, like your personal likes or dislikes, personal opinions or prejudices or sympathy. What that means is you have to decide the case fairly and based solely on the evidence. The oath that you took just now confirms that obligation.

In following the instructions that I give you now and I will give you later you have to follow all of them and not single out some and ignore others, they are all equally importantly.

I explained to you already what this case is about. I will not read the claims and defenses again. Suffice it to say that this is an employment discrimination case and the plaintiffs have made allegations which the defendants deny and

1 || we

we have you here to decide this.

Civil cases are decided by a standard of prove called preponderance of evidence. What that means is that when a party has the burden of proof on any claim that you must be persuaded by evidence that the claim is more probably true than not. It's often described as just tilting the balance, 51 percent wins in a civil case. The quantum of evidence you may find is much higher than that, much lower, all it takes when a party has a burden on an issue or a claim or a defense it is to convince you it is who are likely true than not.

You should base your decision in the case on all of the evidence regardless of which party presented it.

The evidence that you are to consider in deciding what the facts consist of consists of the following:

First, you are going to hear sworn testimony from witnesses. They are going to be called, they will take an oath to tell the truth and certainly is going to be the bulk of the evidence in this case, sworn testimony.

I anticipate that already also going to be physical exhibits. There is going to be probably documents, maybe some photographs, I don't know for sure, but there will be things that are marked as evidence. If those things are received in evidence, if you hear me say that will be received in evidence, then you can also consider that. And documentary evidence and that type will go back to you when you deliberate. You will

have that to consider.

Finally, sometimes certain facts are uncontested.

There may be things that are important but neither side contest it, and if that is the case it happens occasionally that the lawyers will agree, they will stipulate that those things are true. It will avoid the necessity of calling a witness unnecessarily. So if the lawyers stipulate to any facts, then you should accept those facts that are agreed to as true and as proved.

Let me tell you in contrast what is not evidence.

First, as I told you, testimony from the stand, things received in evidence and then stipulations are evidence.

Here's what's not evidence:

Arguments and statements by the lawyers are not evidence.

I don't say to deprecate these lawyers, but here's what's true about this. They weren't at the hotel when these things happen. They had to reconstruct this case after the fact much as you will and much as I will. They don't have any historical connection to the case. You should take the evidence from people who do have a historical connection, who were part of this. And so bear that in mind when you hear the lawyers talk about the evidence or characterize the evidence. They are not witnesses, they weren't there, they are doing their best to present the case in their understanding of them.

11.

2.1

Likewise objections and questions by lawyers are not evidence. The lawyers have a duty to their clients to object when they believe a question is improper and the under the rules of evidence and you should not be influenced by a lawyer making an objection or by the court's ruling on it.

From time to time in the course of the trial I may tell you to disregard certain evidence or I will strike it out. That most often comes up when a witness is asked a question and hears the question differently than what's intended or the way the rest of us hear it and then answers non-responsive.

Sometimes it happens the lawyer will say that is a non-responsive answer, Judge, I ask you to strike that. If I do that, you go through the mental discipline of saying I heard it, but I'm not going to consider it, it's not going to play apart in deciding this case, I'm going to keep it out of my mind. So we ask you to do that if I strike any testimony or disregard any testimony. It doesn't come up often, but it may come up in the course of the case and that's what you are to do if it does.

Finally, anything you see or hear when the court is not in session is not evidence. You will hear this principle in several of the instructions and hear it is:

All of you have to decide the case bear on the same information and that is the evidence that is presented here in court. Nothing outside of that. No external information,

nothing in the newspapers, nothing on the Internet, just what's here.

The lawyers are equipped to present every bit of evidence that you need to have to decide this and you have must do it on the basis of what you hear in this case.

Remember, jury service is not like Survivor, it's not independent decisions that are being made outside the presence of others.

You are going to hear both direct and circumstantial evidence. Some of these allegations have to do what did somebody intend, what was on their mind and obviously the only way we can infer what is on somebody's mind is by circumstantial evidence. We consider what they said and did as indicating what they were thinking Teatley.

Direct evidence is direct prove of a fact, such as testimony by a witness about what that witness personally saw or personally heard or personally did.

In contrast, circumstantial evidence is indirect evidence. It is proof of one fact from which you can infer another fact.

If the issue to be tried before you is whether a jet plane flew over the court house this morning, a party could proffer that by calling in a witness that say yeah, I looked up and I saw the plane and it flew over and if you believe that you can find for that party.

Another way of proving it is somebody can come in and say you know, I didn't see a plane, I didn't here a rumble of jet engines, but I saw one of those vapor trails that planes leave and it was just starting to break apart, and you can say, well, okay, the vapor trail must mean a plane had flown over. You can infer that fact.

The point is direct and circumstantial evidence are both competent ways of proving facts. Sometimes circumstantial evidence gets a bad rap if you watch TV lawyer programs and say circumstantial evidence. That is not true in real life. Both forms of evidence are competent. Ultimately it's up to you to decide how much weight to give either form of evidence, direct or circumstantial.

I alluded to the rules of evidence and I predicted to you that there will be objections in this case. There are rules of evidence that control what can be received in evidence. They are contained in a big book like this. You go to law school to learn those rules of evidence.

Now, at least the misconception sometimes a lawyer will object and sometimes the juror will think why are they objecting to that, I really want to know the answer to that, why is that being hidden from me. That's the wrong way to look at it. The rules of evidence have been maintained and have come together over a long period, hundreds of years. The object of the rules of evidence is to make sure you get

reliable information on which to base a decision. That way once you reach a verdict in this case, no one can undercut it by saying, oh, of course they reached that decision, look at the kind of information that they had.

I will give you an example of one of the rules of evidence that establishes this point that I'm making.

We have a rule called hearsay. All of you heard that term before. Hearsay generally prohibits somebody from coming before the court and saying what somebody else said outside of court and the reason behind that rule is the context of a statement is often very important. We want to know what the circumstances are, we want to hear it from the speaking himself or herself.

The hearsay rule is designed to make sure that you get the context of a statement when that statement is used in court.

Now, there are a lot of exceptions to the hearsay rule, but it proves my point about why these rules exist. They exist to insure that you get reliable information on which to base a decision.

So if a lawyer makes an objection in this case, understand that we are doing our best to insure that the evidence that you get will be reliable and can be counted on. You shouldn't make any inference from the fact that a lawyer is making an objection or how I rule on it.

If I overrule an objection, that means that the question can be answered or the exhibit can be received. If I sustain an objection, that means I have determined that it is not admissible under the rules of evidence.

Again, don't draw any inference from the court's ruling on objections or from lawyers making objections.

I mentioned to several of the prospective jurors that in deciding this case you may have to decide which testimony to believe and which testimony not to believe. You, as jurors, may believe everything a witness says or a part of it or none of it at all.

Here's a non-exclusive list of factors for you to keep in mind as you listen to testimony in this case. These are common sense things that if we had to write them down or articulate them these are things that would inform them in making judgments in our daily life, but they also apply in court.

First, ask yourselves what opportunity and ability did the witness have to see or hear or know the things that he or she is testifying about.

Second, ask yourselves what's the state of the witness' memory? Is it good or is it sketchy?

Third, it's very important, I alluded to this during the jury selection process, what is the witness' manner while testifying?

(212) 805-0300

It's often said that we, jurors in particular, have lie detector instincts. They can look at somebody and have kind of a sixth sense. As you heard me say not coincidental that courtrooms are arranged with the witness stand very close to the jury box. We want up to pay attention.

Fourth, ask yourselves does the witness have any interest in the outcome of the case or do I detect any obvious bias or prejudice on the part of this witness. That can also determine whether you believe or disbelieve a witness.

Is there other evidence that contradicts the witness' testimony. That should be a consideration.

Does the witness' testimony seem reasonable to you in light of all the evidence.

You have been selected because the lawyers have made a judgment here that you are intelligence, experienced, conscientious people. We want you to apply those facilities here. Apply your experience, apply your common sense.

Finally, any other factors that you think bear on believability you may consider.

As I said, this is a non-exclusive non-exhaustive list. Use your God common sense in assessing the evidence in this case.

Remember this, also, that the weight of the evidence as to a fact doesn't necessarily depend on how many witnesses testify about it, what that means is your task isn't just to

1.4

count up the number of witnesses on one side or the other and go with the side that calls the most witness, your task is not quantitative, it's qualitative. You look at the quality of the evidence. You can be convinced by the testimony of a single witness that something happened or didn't happen. Likewise, one side or the other may call many witnesses and you can say I don't believe it, I don't care if they call ten witnesses, I know things don't happen like that, I'm not going to believe that. Again, it's not a counting exercise, it is an evaluation of the quality of the testimony that you will hear.

Let me say a few words about your conduct as jurors before I release you for the lunch break.

First, you are to keep an open mind throughout this trial. As you heard me explain and discuss with Mr. Montalio. This doesn't mean, this instruction doesn't mean that you don't form preliminary impressions. You are going to form preliminary impressions. That's what we do as human beings. We here information, we process information, we have impressions about it. What this really means is exercise the discipline in your mind to say I'm not going to let myself decide that I'm voting this way or that way until I've heard everything.

This case is going to involve the presentation of several witnesses. You are going to hear from the lawyers once you return from your lunch break. They are going to tell you

what they think they are going to prove and at the end they will sum up the case for you, they think what they have prove. You are going to get instructions of the law and an important component of this, as I said, is the viewpoint of fellow jurors. It's not uncommon that people change their minds about impressions that they had during jury deliberations.

I sat as a juror once, believe it or not. I said this is going to be easy. I went back, I tried a lot of cases, I thought I got this down, and guess what? We got in the jury room and people began talking and I will said I have never thought about that. That's a good point. And it turned me around on some of my preliminary impressions.

That can and possibly will happen to some of you. So keep an open mind until the time the case is finally submitted to you.

Second, because you must decide this case based on the evidence and on the instructions you should not be exposed to any other information about the case.

I don't think there is any press coverage of this cases. It's not like you will pick up the paper tomorrow and see it splashed on the front of the paper. We don't allow cameras in federal courts, there won't be TV coverage, but more generally what you are reading concerns sexual harassment claims, put it aside until this case is over if you are inadvertently exposed to I. We want you to decide the case

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

based on the evidence here.

Another component of this is that you should not attempt to do any research about the case on your own. Again, that would violate this rule that all eight of you decide the case on strictly what is presented here.

One of the problems with juror selection, jury service is we want conscientious people, we want people who are going to try to get it right and apply their good common sense, but those are the very people that say I want to do a good job so I'm going to look something up on the Internet, I'm going to Google it to make sure I got this right.

You can't do that in this case. You can't look to outside sources. You have to rely on the lawyers to present the relevant evidence.

You may or may not have heard about this case. We had a case in California a few years ago against a guy named Scott He killed his pregnant waiver and dropped her at the Peterson. bottom of the ocean.

Did that make the news back here?

The presentation of evidence in that case took seven The lawyers were presenting evidence for seven months. months. Just as jury deliberations started, one of the jurors got on the Internet and looked up some term. Fortunately, the judge was able to catch that and singled her out before she told the other jurors about what she had seen and kind of contaminated

them, but she had to be removed from the jury after seven months after sitting and listening to the evidence.

So don't do that. If you do that I would have to remove you and there is a chance we would have to start all over this which would cost everybody a lot of time and money and effort. As I said, I'm only here for two weeks so we got to get this done this week.

Finally, regarding this case and your duty not to talk about it, don't let other people approach you and talk about the case, either. If that happens, and I don't think it will, report that immediately to Mr. Lopez and he will tell me because I want to know about that. No one should approach you and attempt to talk to you about this case nor should you engage anyone in conversation about this.

Now, we have provided note pads for you or well. They will be under your chairs. You are permitted to take notes during this case if you want to. As I said it is anticipated this will be a relatively short case. If you are good in compartment meant living information, then just sit back and listen, you don't have to take notes. If you feel more comfortable jotting down a note or two you are free to do that.

One caution I give if you do take notes, it is a divided attention task. Don't be so ensconced in your notes that you miss the bleeding he will elephant traipsing in the room.

I see some conscientious jurors trying to take everything down. That's why we have a court reporter taking down everything. So bear that in mind.

Speaking of our court reporter, we do not have, despite all of our innovations and technology, we don't have an ability to push a button and have an immediate script, we don't have that. So pay careful attention to it. We don't have a transcript for you. You can't say judge, we want to listen to so-and-so's testimony, have it read back. We don't have a transcript. Those are prepared usually long after a trial has concluded, if at all. So pay careful attention. You will have to rely primarily on your memory of the testimony here. As I said, it's going to be a fairly short trial so that shouldn't be difficult. This isn't a seven month ordeal.

Let me remind you one last time:

Don't discuss the case with any one.

Don't form any fixed opinions about the case or what your verdict should be until it is submitted to you.

Keep an open mind.

Okay. It is 12:15. Here's what we will do. We will break until 1:15. The admonition I will tell you, remember the admonition and it means all those does and don't, I won't repeat it fully each time.

Please be back in your seats at 1:15.

Remember if there is a line downstairs tell the court

06BYVER3 security officer I'm a sitting juror, I need to get through and 1 2 they will put you to the front of the line. Have a pleasant lunch. See you at 1:15. 3 (The jury left the courtroom) 4 5 All right, the jury is not present, counsel and the parties are present. 6 7 Any issues we need to take up before we recess? 8 MS. FRIDEGOTTO: You had issues regarding the 9 exhibits. 10 I will talk to you about that. MR. GOLDBERG: 11 MS. FRIDEGOTTO: Thank you very much, your Honor. 12 THE COURT: Again, let me remind you, our preference 13 is we take up legal issues on the breaks. I hate to cut in 14 your lunch break. I will be here generally by 8:30 or after the day's session in court. 15 16 If there is something that you in your judgment I just 17 have to talk to the judge at side bar, then I will entertain it, but I discourage side bars. They are a waste of time. 18 19 Have a nice lunch. I will see you at 1:15. 20 (Luncheon recess) 21 22

23

24

25

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

AFTERERNOON SESSION

1:15 o'clock p.m.

(In open court the; jury present)

THE COURT: We are back on the record.

THE CLERK: All jurors present, your Honor.

THE COURT: This begins the matter of Veerman investigate Deep Blue Group, et al.

Ladies and gentlemen, at this time let me give you a little forecast of what to expect.

A trial begins typically with opening statements by the lawyers. Open statements, remember, is not evidence because it comes from the lawyer, but each lawyer is permitted to stand before you and give you sort of a road map or outline of what he or she thinks the evidence is going to be so you will hear from the lawyers first.

Once the opening statements are completed, then the plaintiff begins the presentation of evidence. Plaintiff will call their witnesses first. Mr. Fridegotto will examine the witnesses on direct examination and then they will be cross-examined by defense counsel, Ms. Fridegotto, and we will go through all the plaintiffs' witnesses until they have completed their case.

At that point the defense will have an opportunity to present its case and tables will turn, Ms. Fridegotto will call witnesses examining them on direct exam and Mr. Goldberg, as

1 | plaintiffs' counsel, will cross-examine them.

Once all the evidence is complete, I will give you those final instructions that I alluded to on the law, you will hear arguments of counsel and the case will be to you.

That's what to expect in the upcoming days.

For now we are at the very forefront of the trial process. You are about to hear opening statements from counsel.

Mr. Goldberg, you may make your opening statements.

MR. GOLDBERG: I would like to start by thanking all of you for serving as jurors.

I echo what the judge said earlier, that jury service is very important and we understand that it is taking out of your busy lives to be here and the parties will do their best to put on their case as expeditiously as we can and I do thank you again.

May name is Kenneth Goldberg. I'm an attorney, and I'm here today with an attorney from my office, Jonathan Margolis, and my two clients.

I wanted to reintroduce them to you as you will be hearing from them testify.

This is Beatrice Veerman, she is one of the plaintiffs in the case.

The other plaintiff is Khadijetou Ba.

This is a sexual harassment case. It's a case about

2

3

4

5 6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13 14

15

16

17

18 19

20

21

22 23

24

25

two former employees of a restaurant.

Let me make sure that I prefaced my comments by telling you, I'm not a witness, I'm giving you what the judge just described as a road map of the case from our perspective, the plaintiffs' perspective. I get two chances to speak to you directly, this one, my opening statement, and then at the end of the case when I give a summation.

My clients, Ms. Veerman and Ms. Ba, worked at Opia Restaurant. It's an upscale restaurant in midtown Manhattan.

The restaurant was managed by two of the defendants sitting at that table, Mr. Blech is on the right and Mr. Lesort is to the left. Opia is owned by an entity named Deep Blue Group so they are a defendant. The name on the outside is The paychecks are Deep Blue Group. That's why they are defendants in the case.

Mr. Blech and Mr. Lesort are defendants as well, because my clients I intend to prove you to you that those two gentleman sexually harassed them. That's why they are here. That's what they stand accused of. As I had said before, this is a sexual harassment case.

There are some other claims which I will outline for you as well, but will certainly a large part of what you are going to hear about are the allegations of sexual harassment.

As for Ms. Ba, who is going to testify this afternoon, she is going to tell you her story, why she went to Opia, what

happened there, how she left her job.

She alleges that she was terminated from Opia because she rejected and complained about the sexual advances of Mr. Blech, who is sitting at that table.

She also says she lost her job because she was deemed to be too dark by Mr. Lesort, one of the co-owners.

She also says that she lost her job because she did not give Opia back about \$600, actually, \$569, when a table left a restaurant without signing the credit card slip and she served that party and she had given them the credit card slip and they left the restaurant without signing it, and we say that that breaks the law to fire her for not giving back the restaurant that \$569.

Ms. Veerman says, and she is going to testify, that she was sexually harassed by Mr. Lesort, that she rejected his advances, complained about it and ultimately she lost her job. She lost her job less than a month after she forcefully rejected one of his advances to her and made it crystal clear that it was enough, enough is enough. That's the gist of what she communicated.

The reason that the restaurant gave for these two ladies leaving we suspect -- I can't tell you what they are going to say until they get up on the witness stand -- we expect them to say Ms. Ba wasn't fired, that she just left the restaurant because she was not happy about the dispute about

the customer's credit card slip. We submit to you the evidence
will show why would Ms. Ba walk out of a job to become
unemployed over a credit card slip if she wasn't being asked to
pay it.

As for Ms. Veerman, we expect the defendants to say, well, you missed a shift and we suspended you and you just never came back.

When you hear from Ms. Veerman and you see the documentation, we submit to you that the story that you are going to see is that Ms. Veerman didn't know she was on the schedule. When she found out she rushed to work. She wasn't allowed to work. She came in the next day, worked the shift for somebody else. She was then fired and told Mr. Lesort doesn't want to deal with you anymore.

Ms. Veerman was not suspended. If she was suspended, where is the work schedule that puts her back on a shift? We are going to show you work schedules, work schedules after she was let go. Her name is nowhere to be found. She was not on the work schedule because she wasn't suspended she was fired. She had no job waiting for her. She had no reason to walk away from the job.

In fact, my two clients went to Opia because they were looking to support themselves. Ms. Veerman, as you will hear, worked at Opia because she was supporting herself as she was going through nursing school.